REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this Patent Application, particularly in view of the above Amendment and the following remarks. No additional fee is required for this Amendment as the number of independent claims is less than three, and the total number of claims is less than originally filed.

Request for Telephone Interview

Applicants kindly request the Examiner to contact the undersigned at (847) 490-1400 to schedule a telephone interview, to discuss the merits of this Patent Application.

Amendment to the Claims

Claim 1 has been canceled and replaced with new Claim 17. Claims 4, 5, and 11 have been canceled in view of new Claim 17. Dependent Claims have been amended to depend from new Claim 17 or independent Claim 15. Claim 15 has been amended to clarify the angle mounting bracket. New Claim 16 has been added to depend from Claim 15. Support for this Amendment can be found in the original claims, and at pages 4 and 5 of the Substitute Specification. No new matter has been added to the claims by this Amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

The rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada, JP 08046381, in view of Chalberg et al., U.S. Patent 7,191,998, is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been canceled and replaced by new independent Claim 17, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

The rejection of Claims 5-8 and 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada, JP 08046381, in view of Chalberg et al., U.S. Patent 7,191,998, and in view of Herzog, German Patent 252474 A1, is respectfully traversed.

As discussed in the Substitute Specification at pages 2 and 3, threaded holes and screws have been used to mount electronic components to cooling plates. However, because the cooling lines run within the plates, the threaded holes are limited in placement and great care needs to taken during mounting when inserting holes matching particular components. Shimada appears to show a possible solution to the problem, by inserting nuts into grooves along the mounting plate. However, the result is the multiple grooves shown in Fig. 1. As shown in Fig. 2, the Shimada

solution has shortcomings. The number and placement of desired grooves are limited by the cooling lines, and vice versa. As can be seen in Fig. 2, the cooling lines are positioned in the existing spacing between grooves, and the multiple grooves limit the possible placements of the cooling lines.

Applicants' claimed invention allows for different sized components to be mounted on a cooling mounting plate without requiring Shimada's multiple grooves extending throughout the plate. Amended Claim 15 recites an angle bracket for mounting an electronic component having a length that is less than the distance between a first groove and a second groove. The angle bracket includes a level base plate (34), a clamping area (36) offset from the level base plate (34), an elongated hole (38) in the level base plate (34), and a screw (32) passing through the elongated hole (38) and coupled with a screw nut positioned within one of the first groove (20) or the second groove (22). The level base plate is placed against the mounting plate body and the clamping area clamps onto a protrusion of the electronic component when the screw is tightened with respect to the screw nut. Thus, the plate can accommodate different sizes of components with the same grooves, e.g., components having screw holes matchingly spaced to the grooves, and components too short to span the distance between the grooves. As shown in Applicants' figures, the

midsection of the mounting plate is not encumbered by multiple grooves, thereby freeing space for the desired configuration of cooling conduits.

The Office Action states that the use of brackets with elongated holes to secure electrical devices is common. The Office Action then applies Chalberg for teaching a bracket with an elongated hole. However, the angle bracket of Chalberg is quite structurally and functionally different from Applicants' recited angle bracket. Chalberg discloses a bracket having multiple angled portions for securing a water pump in a bathtub installation. The Chalberg bracket does not provide the recited structure for clamping electronic components to cooling mounting plates, as in Applicants' claimed invention.

The Examiner applied Herzog for disclosing an alleged angle bracket having Applicants' recited level base plate and clamping area. However, it appears clear from the figures of Herzog that the arms 5 and 9 do not secure the element 1 to the element 2. As seen in Figs. 1 and 2, the screw 8 extends through an opening in element 1 to secure element 1 to element 2. As also shown in Fig. 2, the alleged angle bracket actually becomes detached at the connection to element 2 upon tightening of the screw 8.

Neither Herzog nor Chalberg, alone or in combination, provides any suggestion or motivation to use Applicants' angle bracket for use in mounting

components to a cooling plate, as in Applicants' claimed invention. This is supported by the fact that none of the references provide a clamping bracket having the configuration of Applicants' recited angle bracket which can actually clamp a component to a mounting plate. Applicants respectfully assert that the purported combination does not provide the claimed invention and would not have suggested the claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants assert that the claimed invention would not have been obvious over the combination of Shimada, Chalberg, and Herzog. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

New Claims

New Claim 16 recites an angle bracket as discussed above for Claim 15.

Applicants believe the above comments for Claim 15 also apply to Claim 16, and are not repeated for sake of brevity.

Conclusion

Applicants intend to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action. If the Examiner detects any issue which the Examiner believes Applicants

have not addressed or resolved in this response, the undersigned attorney again requests a telephone interview with the Examiner.

Applicants sincerely believe that this Patent Application is now in condition for allowance and, thus, respectfully request early allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark D. Swanson

Registration No. 48,498

Pauley Petersen & Erickson 2800 West Higgins Road Suite 365 Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60169 (847) 490-1400 FAX (847) 490-1403